Case 1:12-cr-00615-JPO Document 38 Filed 03/13/14 Page 1 of 33 1

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKX UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. 12 CR 615 (JPO) AMIR ABBAS TAMIMI, Defendant. New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys	DapWtamC	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, v. 12 CR 615 (JPO) AMIR ABBAS TAMIMI, Defendant. New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
AMIR ABBAS TAMIMI, Defendant. New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
Defendant. New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	V.	12 CR 615 (JPO)
New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	AMIR ABBAS TAMIMI,	
New York, N.Y. October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	Defendant.	
October 25, 2013 10:45 a.m. Before: HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	x	
HON. J. PAUL OETKEN, District Judge APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant		October 25, 2013
APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	Before:	
APPEARANCES PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	HON. J. PAUL	OETKEN,
PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant		District Judge
United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorneys SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	APPEARANC	CES
	Southern District of New York JASON P.W. HALPERIN ANDREA L. SURRATT Assistant United States Attorn SAEID B. AMINI Attorney for Defendant	neys

DapWtamC

(Case called)

MR. HALPERIN: Good morning, your Honor. Jason
Halperin and Andrea Surratt, for the government, and with us at
counsel table are Thomas Smith of the Department of Commerce,
Matthew Fede of the Homeland Security Investigation and Michael
Dabbo of the F.B.I.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. AMINI: Good morning, your Honor. Saeid Amini, for the defendant, Amir Abbas Tamimi.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I didn't have an opportunity to talk to him. I don't know if I can have five minutes. He just walked in. I came early this morning to see him. He wasn't brought in. I didn't have an opportunity to talk to him. He wanted to make a statement. I wanted to go over his statement. I don't know if I could have like a couple minutes with him because of the translation of his statement. I want to make sure the translator is also having a copy of what he wants to say so there's no misunderstanding.

THE COURT: You need about five minutes?

MR. AMINI: Five minutes, I would appreciate it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Sure.

(Recess)

THE COURT: We're scheduled for sentencing in this

case, and there are a number of submissions. I want to start by just making sure I've received everything I should have. In preparation for today, I've reviewed the presentence report with an addendum and recommendation by the probation department, submission by defense counsel, Mr. Amini, dated September 29, submission by the government, dated October 18, a further submission by the defendant, dated October 23, and the government's surreply, dated October 24, and there are various attachments to several of those.

Do I have everything I should have?

MR. HALPERIN: From the government, yes, your Honor.

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. Just that last submission by the government, I did not get an opportunity to reply. I'm just going to make an oral argument.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Amini, have you read the presentence report and discussed it with your client?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Tamimi, have you read the presentence report and discussed it with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Halperin, have you reviewed the presentence report?

MR. HALPERIN: We have, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are there any objections to the presentence report?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, our objection is to the base offense level of 26. We believe it is 14 and we argued for that, and anything related to the base offense level, we object.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. AMINI: Other than that, we have no objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: We need to swear the interpreter.

(Interpreter sworn)

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, the government has no objections to the PSR.

THE COURT: So the objection with respect to the base offense level, you argue should be 14 instead of 26, is that right?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And this was an argument that you preserved, I think, in the plea agreement. I'm going to start with the guideline calculation, and then I'm going to give each party a chance to speak. I'll tell you now I haven't decided whether to go forward with sentencing today because I think there's a disputed factual issue. It doesn't, I don't think, go to the guideline calculation but goes to the appropriate sentence, and I think the culpability of the defendant under the factors under 18 U.S.C. 3553(a), and that disputed factual issue is what was the defendant involved in this exportation of

helicopter parts for. Was it for the Red Crescent, as he has said under oath, or was it for an entity associated with the Iranian military, which is what the government says he admitted.

As I say, I don't think the guideline calculation changes based on a determination between the two versions of events, but I think it matters to me in what an appropriate sentence would be considering all of the factors under the statute. I'm considering holding an evidentiary hearing on that issue, a Fatico hearing, and we could do it today if people are prepared, but I didn't give any notice of this, so I would be prepared to adjourn the sentencing to a later point when we can schedule an evidentiary hearing and people can prepare for that.

In any event, having said that, I want to start with the guideline calculation and then give the parties an opportunity to address anything relating to sentencing, including the issue I've raised about the motivation and purpose behind the defendant's conduct. The starting point in determining sentence is the guidelines, which is a recommended or advisory starting point for any sentencing based on the base offense level of various categories of offenses and then the criminal history category of the defendant. The Court is no longer required to follow the Sentencing Guidelines, but I am still required to consider the applicable guidelines before

imposing sentence, and it is the lodestar, or the lodestone, in any sentencing decision. So it is the starting point, and I'm going to start by going through the guideline calculation.

In this case, there was a plea agreement in which the parties stipulated to a guideline calculation subject to defendant's right to argue that the base offense level is 14 instead of 26.

Other than that, are there any other issues regarding the accuracy of the guideline calculation in the presentence report?

MR. HALPERIN: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. AMINI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Based on the absence of objection and my own independent calculation of the guidelines, I accept the guideline calculation in the presentence report. On the disputed issue, I do conclude that the base offense level is 26 under the guidelines. I've used the sentencing guideline manual effective November 1, 2012. I find under 2M5.1 of the guidelines the base offense level is 26. 26 applies where national security controls were evaded. Several courts have held that this provision applies if the embargo or sanction was adopted for national security purposes and irrespective of whether the particular item itself presents a national security issue. I believe here, it probably does present a national security issue, but even if it doesn't, the controls at issue

clearly are national security controls. IEEPA and the particular provisions at issue here were clearly adopted for national security purposes, and I conclude that they were, therefore, national security controls for purposes of 2M5.1.

The defendant is entitled to a three-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility. At least that's my initial conclusion subject to further evidence, if I decide to have an evidentiary hearing. That would mean the total offense level is 23, the criminal history category I, because there are no known prior offenses, and that yields a guideline range of 46 to 57 months.

I now would like to give defense counsel, Mr. Amini, an opportunity to speak on behalf of defendant, if you wish to say anything.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, this is a regulatory violation. It is not in any way a violent crime. That's No.

1. And then also, the government never made any allegation on the scale or the amount of the alleged transaction.

THE COURT: On the what?

MR. AMINI: Alleged transaction. The amount and the quantity and the quality of it, it's just a blanket saying there was helicopter parts. There's no list of helicopter parts they are talking about and how much the transaction really amounted to.

THE COURT: You mean how much money is involved?

MR. AMINI: Right, and I believe that, your Honor, is very important for sentencing purposes. And there are big sentences the courts have given if this was involving large transactions and actually an export was made. In this case, no export was made. It was just an attempt. This defendant was arrested upon his arrival.

THE COURT: Right. You keep calling it an attempt, but it's a conspiracy. I mean, he pleaded guilty to conspiracy, I think. Right?

MR. HALPERIN: Correct.

MR. AMINI: The conspiracy was an attempt to.

THE COURT: Conspiracy to attempt?

MR. AMINI: Attempt to purchase, not export.

Your Honor, we are separating the line, attempt to actually make the shipment, there's an attempt to actually, to purchase. This item was never purchased. This attempt is before any shipment. There's no shipment arrangement that has been made. There's no money transaction that has been made in this case, and I believe that is actually important for purpose of 31 C.F.R. 560.203 and 204, which are advisory. Being a non-U.S. person, attempt really, attempt to purchase something as a non-U.S. person doesn't apply. 31 C.F.R. 560.204 applies to a foreign person, but it requires actually shipment.

THE COURT: But he pleaded guilty to conspiracy to violate IEEPA; in other words, agreeing with other people to

engage in this exportation of goods via Korea to Iran unlawfully. So whether the transaction was completed or not doesn't matter. That's how conspiracy works.

MR. HALPERIN: Exactly.

THE COURT: I don't understand this argument that the statute doesn't apply. The statute criminalizes conspiracy to violate IEEPA. That's agreeing with others to engage in the exportation.

MR. AMINI: But, your Honor, the level of the violation, just to conspire to do something, that conspire actually has something done. I conspire and then I make arrangement and then I do it. That is different from I conspire but nothing happens. That is what I'm trying to say. In this case, nothing happened. No purchase was made. No payment was made. The conspiracy died at infancy, while in gestation.

THE COURT: That happens in every conspiracy case where the government stops it from being completed.

MR. AMINI: I believe the courts have looked at this differently when it comes to sentence when actually the shipment was made, was conspired and the shipment was made.

THE COURT: Okay.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ AMINI: And the cases really did not even go any farther.

THE COURT: I understand. Anything else that you

wanted to add? I've read all your submissions. Is there anything else you would like to add?

MR. AMINI: The government is alleging many things which is not in the four corners of the indictment. We don't have any documentation or any affidavit from anyone and they just make a statement and I would like the Court to order that such an allegation that my client made an admission, those should be produced with the transcript before the next hearing.

MR. HALPERIN: Judge, I'm not clear on what counsel's talking about because everything we have put into our sentencing submission was produced in the voluminous discovery produced to defendant and defense counsel, as were his postarrest proffer 302s, which contain many of the admissions that we cite in our sentencing submission. So I'm just not clear as to what defense counsel is referring to.

THE COURT: You have the discovery he's referring to, right?

MR. AMINI: Right, but I haven't seen what they actually made these allegation sentencing report.

Specifically, the defendant admitting these are for military.

THE COURT: Admitting what?

MR. AMINI: This is for military, for the Iranian military.

THE COURT: If you're done with your statement, I'll let Mr. Tamimi make his statement, if he'd like.

1 MR. A

MR. AMINI: Sure.

THE COURT: Mr. Tamimi, if there's anything you would like to say, you're welcome to do so now.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, greetings. As you are informed, I was arrested on October 5, 2012, on IEEPA charges.

As you're aware, I was arrested on October 5, 2012, on IEEPA charges. As the law explicitly indicates that it is for the people who are U.S. persons, people who are residents of the United States or have residency in the United States. I've never been a resident in this country and I've never committed any crime either in this country or my own country.

Your Honor, Mr. Prosecutor unfortunately repeats the same thing over and over several times and the repeated contacts by Mr. Ghojolo from the United States with me causes that a negative mentality in you and whoever presents to them. Your Honor, I have question for you. I was not in contact with this gentleman for several years. Who was it who contacted me for the first time? And who was the person who initiated this transaction and who created this entrapment for me?

THE INTERPRETER: I'm sorry, your Honor.

(Interpreter conferred with defendant)

THE DEFENDANT: Who was the person who contacted the government agents who insisted, who insisted to me and who intended to sell these spare parts. Your Honor, I did not even have his contact number so that I would even call him.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Generally, everybody in the world, there are two sides to a transaction, have the basic information about each other, like the contact telephone number, fax. He called me every day, but I can't obtain his equipment.

Your Honor, the prosecutor states that the company in Iran wanted this equipment for military purposes. Please note a few things. First of all, since 1973 up to now, none of the Bell helicopters of any kind were sold to Iran. And it's close to 40 years that no transactions have taken place. And it's obvious that the equipment of the helicopters from 40 years ago cannot be up to date and with the best technology, and by referring to the manufacturing shows that all of them were obsolete. The Iranian Red Crescent in Iran, as a part owner of some of this equipment, lacks any repair or facility for technical repairs, and, therefore, it has to contact the said company Panha, the only exclusive agent for procurement and providing of technical services for the helicopter. And this company acts for the technical inspection and gives a list of the equipment necessary for the repair to the owner. refer to the list that I requested from Mr. Ghojolo, and that list was only about the motor part of the helicopter and it included screws, bolts, and washers and did not have any special military application.

Your Honor, my father, because of my mother's passing away and brain illness, is under my care, and because he cannot

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

move he is highly dependent on me. And also my wife because of the cancerous illness of breast and --

THE INTERPRETER: Sorry, your Honor.

(Interpreter conferred with defendant)

THE INTERPRETER: Sorry.

THE DEFENDANT: -- history, has had several surgeries and also needs an urgent surgery again. And also my only daughter, who is 11 years old, is highly dependent on me.

Your Honor, I hope that this sentencing is close to 14 months, be a good punitive measure for me, and I sincerely apologize to the United States Government for this incident and for what happened. And I hope that by pardoning me you make my family happy. And I thank you for the opportunity you gave me.

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated.

Again, I've received your submission, Mr. Halperin, but if there's anything you would like to say on behalf of the government, you may.

MR. HALPERIN: A few words. Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, let me address the Court's initial inquiry first about the need for Fatico. We respectfully submit that we don't need a Fatico to resolve the facts because the government has proffered as part of its sentencing submission and as part of the facts in the case, we've included Exhibit A, telephone conversation in which Mr. Tamimi admitted that the merchandise was being acquired or attempted to be acquired for

military purposes. He's also not challenged the government's representations in his postarrest interviews that he made admissions it was for officials connected with the Iranian Air Force. So I do think the Court has a factual basis to find by a preponderance of the evidence that these goods were being procured by Tamimi for the Iranian Air Force.

THE COURT: Was there anything in the postarrest statements or any of the e-mails or any of the other documents referring to Red Crescent?

MR. HALPERIN: No.

THE COURT: Your view is that's just a made-up story?

MR. HALPERIN: I view that as completely made up to try to get leniency from this Court and that when he said that today and at the plea hearing that was completely false and completely contrary to everything he had said both during the course of the investigation when we had those recorded conversations, as set forth in Exhibit A, and over the course of four days of the postarrest interviews last October where he never mentioned the Iranian Red Crescent.

With the Court's permission, I'll proceed to make a few points related to sentencing.

THE COURT: Let me first ask. Did you consider moving for or asking for an obstruction of justice increase? He said that under oath in his plea allocution.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, we had a plea agreement at

the time of the plea, and, at the plea, the falsity of that had not yet been clear to the government. That was the first time we ever heard it mentioned; it was at the actual plea allocution, and, as we said in our surreply, we were focused on the plea allocution, making sure he acknowledged all the elements of the offense, and we thought we would address this at the sentencing. So the first time we ever heard the supposed Red Crescent excuse was on July 10, at the July 10 plea allocution. And then between that date and today, we have had several meetings with the agents where they have underscored for us the falsity of those statements that Mr. Tamimi made at the allocution.

So we did not think it was, very fairly we could have probably sought a denial of acceptance of responsibility points and/or obstruction, but we have a plea agreement, and in this case we decided to stand by our plea agreement but vigorously ask for a guidelines range sentence. We thought that was the appropriate way to handle it.

THE COURT: If there were a <u>Fatico</u> hearing on this issue of was it for someone connected to the military/contracted for the military versus this Red Crescent organization, I've seen your submission where you attach --

MR. HALPERIN: Exhibit A.

THE COURT: You have an e-mail, you have a summary of the call. Are there actual transcripts of calls or recordings?

MR. HALPERIN: We could certainly have a transcript made. I think this is a summary of a recorded telephone conversation, so a <u>Fatico</u> would simply consist of us either having an official transcript made by an F.B.I. Farsi-speaking translator and/or if the Court wanted to hear the initial recording, which I believe is in Farsi, the agents are nodding yes, we could play that. And then the only other thing that a <u>Fatico</u> might entail is we could put one of the F.B.I. agents who handled the postarrest interviews on the stand where Mr. Tamimi acknowledged that it was for this official connected with the Iranian Red Crescent — excuse me, with the Iranian Air Force.

THE COURT: Are there F.B.I. 302 reports?

MR. HALPERIN: There are, which have been produced in discovery, and we're happy to provide those to the Court.

THE COURT: What do they say?

MR. HALPERIN: They say essentially that, Judge, if you can give me a moment to get as precise a rendering as possible for the Court. Ms. Surratt points to tape seven. And in paragraph eight on page eight, which is the section talking about Mr. Tamimi's postarrest admission, the government writes, "When asked about the Bell 206 helicopter parts, Tamimi said they were ordered from him by a man named Mohammed," we redacted the last name, "from a company called Panha. Tamimi also admitted that Panha is connected to Iran's Air Force. He

then added that he believed that Mohammad is Basij," and we dropped a footnote explaining what Basig is, which is kind of an arm of the IRGC, the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps.

THE COURT: B-I-S-I-G?

MR. HALPERIN: I'm sorry. B-A-S-I-J.

THE COURT: But his explanation that he just gave today -- is it Panha?

MR. HALPERIN: Panha.

THE COURT: That that is the provider for the Red Crescent.

MR. HALPERIN: And again, we think that that representation that he made today is false, is a lie, because he never said that in the postarrest interviews to the F.B.I.

I'd also point the Court to page four of the government's submission, paragraph two, where during the investigation there was a recording in which Tamimi, on November 15, 2011, reading from page four of our initial submission, paragraph two: "On November 15, 2011, Tamimi told individual one that he," meaning Tamimi, "had just met with Iranian Air Force personnel and that they were interested in individual one's parts and would submit a parts list."

I think based on all these points and pieces of evidence, the Court can certainly find by a preponderance that Tamimi attempted to acquire these goods for the Iranian Air Force.

Sorry, your Honor. Could I just have a moment?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. HALPERIN: I don't know if the Court wants to hear more on that or if I should proceed to the sentencing arguments. Whatever the Court's preference is.

THE COURT: Why don't you go ahead and do the sentencing arguments and I'll give you a chance to respond.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, we've submitted nearly 40 pages in advance of sentencing, so we're certainly not going to repeat many of the points and I'll just say a few words. In this case, the government believes that a guideline range is very appropriate. The offense conduct was serious and significant and undermined and jeopardized the national security of this country. We certainly agree that, as the Court has now found, the base offense level is entirely appropriate since presidents of both parties have found Iran to constitute a threat to our country's national security, and that's why these various executive orders and the sanctions have been put in place.

As we said, Judge, we think it is an important point in terms of the Court's consideration of the 3553(a) factors, the nature and circumstances of the offense, that Mr. Tamimi was trying to acquire these goods for the Iranian Air Force. He said that during the investigation, and he said it after his arrest. The fact that it was for the military makes the

offense that much more serious.

Now, your Honor, we believe that he's lied to the Court on two occasions about this absurd story that he was trying to acquire the goods for the Red Crescent. He never said that during the course of the investigation or in the postarrest interviews. I think it's important for the Court to consider Tamimi 's role in the conspiracy, which was vital in this case. He was the one who enlisted the shippers in South Korea. He identified them, he then recruited them and brought them into the conspiracy saying that he had worked with them before and that he knew that one of them, who was based in South Korea, would charge more for sensitive items in violation of the sanctions against Iran.

He and the coconspirators talked about how they would falsify shipping labels to evade customs from the United States and South Korea. They talked about how they would hide the ultimate destination of the goods on the packages, so the evidence shows that Tamimi had an international network of criminal associates that he could call on, which he did in this case.

Your Honor, we do believe deterrence is a vital Section 3553(a) factor in this case. A guidelines range sentence would emphasize that conduct designed to evade the United States sanctions on Iran will not be tolerated no matter who commits the crime and no matter where in the world they're

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think what you heard, the final point here, Judge, located. what you heard from Mr. Tamimi today was a real lack of remorse. Excuses, a new 11th-hour claim of entrapment and a discussion about Bell helicopters and how he just told the Court, and obviously I don't have the official transcript in front of me, that no Bell helicopters had been sold to Iran for I think the Court should respectfully ask itself how Mr. Tamimi would know that, how does he have such a clear knowledge of what the Iranian government has imported from the United States as it relates to Bell helicopters. I think that only underscores our argument that this defendant before this Court has connections, strong connections, to the Iranian government, to the Iranian Air Force, that he would even know and be able to describe to the Court in his view the history of Iran's imports or lack thereof of these Bell 206 helicopter components.

Your Honor, for all these reasons, we strongly request that the Court sentence Mr. Tamimi to a sentence within the quidelines range of 46 to 57 months. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Amini, is there anything you would to respond to?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, the Department of Justice, as I provided in Exhibit F of my initial filing, lists all the citations of similar kind. And today, Mr. Tamimi was made a big player. Department of Justice about this case is a blurb,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is only a couple of lines, included in another case. It's not even standing on its own. For some reason, this case has been blown out of proportion. Your Honor, Mr. Tamimi never lied in the investigation at the beginning or never lied in court. said these parts for this repair company called Panha, Panha repairs all the helicopters. The helicopter parts he was going to be sending was for Red Crescent. Red Crescent are the owner, Red Crescent is the owner of these helicopters, which he was going to get the parts, but it was going to be repaired in the shop, which is owned by, either partially or fully by the government. But there's a Web site. If your Honor allow me, he told me there's a Web site, I will link the Web site so we can see what the Panha is. He admitted the part was for Panha, but he never admitted at any time who was the owner of these helicopters or these parts for.

THE COURT: What about his admission that this person named Mohammed is Basig?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I haven't seen the transcript.

I don't know what the government is relying on. There is a

Farsi translation. I would like to go into looking at the

tapes and see what they're talking about, what discussion, and

we will get the Farsi and translate it to see what he has said.

THE COURT: You may continue.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, Mr. Tamimi said the items which government never gave the list to the Court, we don't

know what items, what component actually they're talking about. They never mentioned that. They just say component. We don't know the type of the component. Mr. Tamimi today testified they are for bolts, bearings, and the washers, and this is not really mentioned by government at any part of their submissions. When they say component, what component? What was the value of this component? What was it going to be used for? They make a blanket, global statement that this is going to harm U.S. safety. They cannot just make that kind of blanket statement. They need some empirical evidence to connect the part that they are saying is going to harm the United States to the part involved. In this case, no such submission or proffer has been made by the government.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: Again, I don't know, your Honor. I have, I can now look at these tape they have given me so I can locate what the government is talking about. I want to know at this arrest there was a translator. There's no transcript at this time, and my client says he never said this was for the Army. He said for Panha, and I don't know how the government is taking the Panha and how they translating it to Basig and getting it to government. Where the Basig was mentioned by my client? I haven't seen such language.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, I believe this is a small

case, and the cases that are cited to the Court just yesterday by the government, your Honor, they are really not similar cases. They have eight, nine cases they submitted, if I may just mention that. The case No. 1 they submitted, I wasn't able to find it in the government listing.

The case No. 2, it deals with U.S. person that actually exported the item, and, your Honor, courts have made a distinction between actually exporting item and trying to export for purpose of sentencing.

Case No. 3 involved 12 defendants. In addition to IEEPA, there's also violation of IECA, so it's not just IEEPA, and also involved export. Your Honor, the case No. 2 involves \$10 million of the shipment that has already been made. In this case, there's no allegation even the amount of the transaction involved. The case No. 3 again is a list of agent about the case \$168,000 forfeited in that case. When there's a forfeiture, that means there was a benefit to the company; there was a transaction involved. In this case, there was no benefit to the plaintiff. There was no transaction involved.

Your Honor, if I may go through all the cases, case

No. 4 and three is the same thing, just repeating twice for two

different defendants.

Case No. 5 involves again shipment, they actually shipped items to Iran. And the person got 30 months in prison, I believe, on that.

The case No. 6, they have as a military and commercial aircraft involves \$500,000 of actual shipment and forfeiture.

And they also involved U.S. persons.

Case No. 8, they have also involved U.S. person, actually exported the items, and it was involving the airplanes, CF65 aircraft engines. Those are not the same kind of bolt and bearing we are talking about in this case. This is a low-level, no-money transaction has there ever been taking place in this case. Mr. Tamimi never paid a penny or put it over for these items. He just sent his list. The contact from New York, he was contacting him. He was contacted and asked for the list and all Tamimi did in this case, just send the list, and he's being prosecuted. He's in jail for just sending a list.

There's been no proffer. There is no proof my client works for the Iranian government, he has connection with the Iranian government. He's just trying to get the part for the Panha so they can repair the helicopters owned by Red Crescent. There's no lying here. There's no falsification here, and I would like to see if the government has anything else.

We believe in this case as recommended by the probation office is one year one day, honestly is more than enough for this person. I cited the case of the doctor that was charged with 33 counts in Northern District of California.

33 counts, he pled to one. He actually exported. The court

gave him 36 months' probation and allowed him to go back to

Iran. He did not spend more than ten days in jail, which was

before he posted bond. We have many, many cases of same kind.

They got either six months or they have been released on

probation or maximum they got one year and one day.

THE COURT: But many of those involved computer parts, or things like that, that don't have as clear a military use.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, that's what I'm really trying to say. The government never gave us the list what the parts are that they, if they have the bearings, the bolt.

THE COURT: Doesn't matter. They're parts for a helicopter. Everyone agrees on that.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, it makes really big difference, the technology. Are they trying to transfer the technology, or these are just the bolt and the bearing? And it's also for whom. Who is the owner? We are standing here again and saying the owner of the helicopter that the bearings was for was Red Crescent, but the repair company is the same repair company.

(Defendant conferred with counsel)

MR. AMINI: He's saying I'm swearing this is the case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. AMINI: If your Honor would give us additional time for briefing, I will review what the government actually is alleging he had admitted to and we'll get proper translation

of it and brief it to the Court before final sentence.

THE COURT: Mr. Halperin.

MR. HALPERIN: Judge, again, we don't see any need for additional briefing. This has been produced in discovery and counsel's had it for months. Counsel just said Tamimi never lied in his postarrest interviews, and we agree that he did not lie by failing to mention, since he never mentioned the Iranian Red Crescent during his postarrest interviews. We believe he was being truthful when he talked about how he was acquiring the parts for an official connected with the Iranian Air Force.

I'd also point out, as I said a few minutes ago, the proof of this point that he was trying to acquire the materials for the Air Force is not limited to his postarrest interviews.

It's also in at least two different recorded conversations as we set forth on page four and page six of our sentencing submission.

No. 1, in paragraph two, on page four, "On November 15, 2011, Tamimi said that he had just met with Air Force personnel and that they were interested in individual one's parts and would submit a parts list."

No. 2, on page 6, paragraph 11, "On March 7, 2012, Tamimi told individual one that one of the coconspirators was with Tamimi in his office in Tehran, and Tamimi said he had just told that coconspirator that the goods were for the military but that on the carton it did not reveal that the

goods were for the military," again, showing the falsification of the documents.

Finally, in terms of probation's recommendation, we vigorously but respectfully disagree with probation's recommendation in this case of a year and a day. We would note that the only 3553(a) factor that probation even discussed in their justification was the supposed family circumstances of the defendant. That is one small factor that ignores the nature and circumstance of the offense, the need to impose just punishment, and, of course, the need for deterrence. And, as we said in our submission, assuming arguendo that the claims about the family situation are true, these are hardly egregious or extremely tragic family circumstances that would justify an enormous departure from the guideline range.

We submit that when balancing as to everything else a guideline range sentence is entirely appropriate in this case. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Did you want to add something else before we take a brief recess?

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, not mentioning Red Crescent in his interview, that doesn't mean he lied. If he was not asked, then he did not say, that is not a lie. The government is making argument that he lied, he did not say. If he was not asked and he did not say this is for Red Crescent, that is not a lie. If he actually said for Iranian Air Force, then he

changes his mind, then that is a lie. He never said this is for the Iranian Air Force, and, your Honor, I have all these CDs and DVDs, a couple of them they just cited. Honestly, I have 16 of them. I've reviewed them.

I want to have opportunity to go back and get actual translation of those calls for those two days with the affidavit submitted to actually show what was mentioned because I want to make sure the translation was done properly. They are relying on two telephone calls and saying he admitted to the Air Force. I want to make sure that admission is here, your Honor, before you impose the sentence, because that is critical, and I do have it. I just have to go and look, and we get affidavit filed with the actual translation so your Honor know what was that telephone call all about, or the government can show it to today in the court so we see what was the admission.

THE COURT: I'm going to take a five-minute recess. (Recess)

THE COURT: I'm going to postpone the ultimate sentencing decision because I would like to at least see some of the evidence on these issues. If I could focus on a couple of issues, I mean, the main issue I have is I want to learn more about what his purpose was in entering into this conspiracy. Was it really for Red Crescent, was it for a military connected or government organization, and the specific

things I'm thinking about are the comment about Mohammad is Basij, the question about Panha and anything about whether that might be connected to the Red Crescent, and then, most basically, any statements tending to show that he knew or understood that these were for the military or for the government. What I have in mind is I would like to see, for example, F.B.I. 302 reports, the various things that are highlighted in the brief, so that I have some understanding of that.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, that certainly makes sense, and we were speaking to the agents during the break and they were saying that by Tuesday, we could have, we've already produced and prepared, I guess, official F.B.I. summaries of two calls in issue, November 15, '11, and March 7, 2012, but by probably the end of the day Monday, early Tuesday, we can have official verbatim transcripts of those calls produced to the Court and defense counsel, along with the recording which has already been produced to defense counsel probably close to a year ago in discovery, but we will produce those as well.

THE COURT: When you say recordings, those are of interviews?

MR. HALPERIN: No, your Honor. I'm sorry. We have recordings of the actual conversations from November 2011 and March 2012.

THE COURT: So we'll be able to get actual

transcripts?

MR. HALPERIN: Yes, because they're in Farsi.

THE COURT: And the four days of interviews were not recorded, were they?

MR. HALPERIN: Correct. They were not recorded. We have F.B.I. 302s that we can produce to the Court. I guess what we'd ask in the first instance, before setting an official, full-blown Fatico hearing is if the government, by, let's say, next Tuesday can produce those things that the Court has asked for to the Court and defense counsel, including the underlying recordings of those two key conversations, that may satisfy everyone's concerns on these points.

THE COURT: Mr. Amini.

MR. AMINI: Your Honor, just getting an affidavit from Panha or from Red Crescent that was their helicopters or they owned helicopters, is that something the Court would entertain? Is the U.S. interested in Tehran, they own the helicopters, they can list what they had and the repair shop in Panha.

MR. HALPERIN: Your Honor, based on our conversations with the agents, I don't think we dispute that Panha may also provide materials to the Red Crescent, so I don't see what purpose that has.

THE COURT: What is Panha, what type of entity?

MR. AMINI: It's just a repair shop, your Honor, a repair shop for helicopters, but actually, I don't know if it's

privately owned. They have a Web site and I can get the link and I can also in briefing, therefore, provide to the Court so the Court can see what kind of organization they are. But I heard from the defendant it's an arm of the Air Force, but actually it is a repair shop where all the even private helicopters because there is no other shop for helicopters to repair.

THE COURT: You don't need to get an affidavit. If there's something on the Web site or something like that, that's fine.

Ms. Surratt.

MS. SURRATT: I was going to chime in some information we know about Panha, but unless the Court wants to hear it now, we can address it later.

THE COURT: You can address it later. In terms of timing, you said you can submit something next week?

MR. HALPERIN: By next Tuesday, your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you be able to respond the following week?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. Seven to ten days.

THE COURT: Whenever you receive the government's submission, is a week enough, or do you want to have ten days for that?

MR. AMINI: I just don't know my schedule right now, your Honor. I'm saying ten days, if I can submit something in

DapWtamC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

four days, I will do so.

THE COURT: At that point, I guess we'll need to schedule, we should schedule a further date for sentencing, since I'm postponing it. How much time do you think? Should we do it in three weeks, or so?

MR. HALPERIN: I'd say no more than three weeks, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is that okay?

MR. AMINI: Yes, your Honor. I have oral argument in Ohio end of November. I just want to make sure it's not that day.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: November 25.

MR. AMINI: November 22.

THE COURT: That's your argument?

MR. AMINI: No. That day is open. Mine is 25th, your Honor.

THE COURT: How about the 15th?

MR. HALPERIN: That works for the government, your Honor.

MR. AMINI: 15th.

MR. HALPERIN: Judge, we'd request, if at all possible, we do a Friday closer to the morning or middle of the day rather than late afternoon.

THE COURT: Could we do 9:30 on the 15th?

MR. AMINI: 9:30.

DapWtamC

1 THE COURT: Is that possible? 2 MR. HALPERIN: That works for the government, your 3 Honor. THE COURT: We'll schedule it for 9:30 on the 15th. 4 I'll look at the submissions and then I guess I'll tell the 5 6 parties in a notice or an order whether I would like to hear 7 any live testimony. I may not, based on what's submitted, but 8 if I do, I'll let the parties know. 9 MR. AMINI: Okay. 10 THE COURT: Is that okay? 11 MR. HALPERIN: That works. 12 THE COURT: Sentencing is adjourned to November 15, 13 2013, at 9:30 a.m. 14 Anything else for today? 15 MR. HALPERIN: Not from the government, your Honor. 16 MR. AMINI: Thank you, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 (Adjourned) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25